

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

EDWARD C. PETERSON,
Petitioner,

CIVIL ACTION

v.

**WARDEN EDWARD BRENNAN,
THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE
COUNTY OF PHILADELPHIA, and
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE
STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA,**
Respondents.

NO. 97-3477

ORDER

AND NOW, this 9th day of June, 2015, upon consideration of “Motion to Reopen Judgment Under F.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)” filed by *pro se* petitioner, Edward C. Peterson (Document No. 124, filed December 3, 2014), for the reasons stated in the accompanying Memorandum dated June 9, 2015, **IT IS ORDERED** as follows:

1. “Motion to Reopen Judgment Under F.R.C.P. 60(b)(6)” filed by *pro se* petitioner, Edward C. Peterson, is **DISMISSED AS UNTIMELY FILED**; and,
2. A certificate of appealability will not issue because reasonable jurists would not debate the propriety of this Court’s procedural ruling. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2); *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

BY THE COURT:

/s/ **Hon. Jan E. DuBois**

DuBOIS, JAN E., J.